## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

DUBLIN DIVISION

SURVEY

DUBLIN DIVISION

JAMES PETERSON,	)
Plaintiff,	)
<b>v.</b>	) CV 306-046
JAMES DONALD, Commissioner, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## ORDER

After a careful, de novo review of the file, the Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which objections have been filed. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the opinion of the Court. Therefore, Plaintiff's requests for entry of default, along with the "Motion to Rebuttal to Defendant's Compliance," are **DENIED**. (Doc. nos. 31, 32, 41, 46, 47). The motion to dismiss Defendant Kelsey without prejudice is GRANTED. (Doc. no. 38).

The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to issue a Scheduling Notice that provides for the Close of Discovery thirty (30) days from the date of this Order, with all other remaining deadlines to follow on the heels of the Close of Discovery as provided for by this Court's

standard Scheduling Notice deadlines.1 Should the parties need additional time to comply with any of the modified deadlines, they may file an appropriate motion containing their request.

so ORDERED this 24th day of May, 2007.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>As the other five Defendants filed their answer on October 30, 2006 (doc. no. 14), using October 30th as the date that the issue joined would result in a situation where all deadlines in the case have passed. Thus, the Court has chosen to used modified deadlines to ensure the efficient resolution to the remainder of the case.